

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6

GEORGE GUADIZ,
Appellant,
v.
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON,
Respondent.

)
)
) Case No. ALLO-00-0009
)
) ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING
) HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE
) DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR
)
)

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

16

17

18

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

1
2 Joanel Zeller Huart, Director's designee, conducted a verification interview with Appellant and Bruce
3 Miller, representative for the University of Washington, to verify and clarify information concerning
4 Appellant's position. During her review, Ms. Huart reviewed the following class specifications:
5 Drapery Fabricator, Utility Worker II, Carpenter, and Maintenance Mechanic I. By memorandum
6 issued April 3, 2000, Ms. Huart informed Appellant that the Maintenance Mechanic I classification
7 provided the best description of his position and she concluded that his position was properly allocated.

8
9 On May 3, 2000, Appellant filed timely exceptions to the Director's determination with the Personnel
10 Appeals Board, and his exceptions are the subject of these proceedings.

11
12 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant argues that the Shade Shop is a one person operation
13 in which he works independently with little or no supervision. Appellant argues that he prioritizes his
14 work, handles all administrative duties, works one-on-one with clients, performs estimating of jobs,
15 orders supplies, and communicates with vendors. Appellant asserts that he should be classified as a
16 Carpenter. Appellant contends that the position had always been a classified as a Carpenter and that the
17 work performed is that of a carpenter. Appellant contends that he spends 15 to 20 percent of his time
18 fabricating shades/blinds and about 50 percent of his time in the field installing the final product and
19 assisting other carpenters to install the product. Appellant argues that his duties are not of a
20 maintenance nature and that very few components on the shades/blinds require maintenance. In the
21 alternative, Appellant argues that he should be classified as a Furniture Repair Worker, which he asserts
22 addresses his duties exactly.

23
24 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent argues the work Appellant performs is not fully
25 consistent with the duties performed by a journey-level carpenter. Respondent argues that Appellant's
26 duties are not skilled duties or the types of duties that a full range journey worker would perform.

Respondent acknowledges that some carpenters may perform tasks that include blinds/shades installation, however, those duties are performed for a minority of their time and do not constitute majority of their overall duties. Respondent also acknowledges that because Appellant's work is specialized and focused, there is no one class specification which encompasses his duties. Respondent argues, however, that in the absence of a classification specification which clearly describes the exact nature of Appellant's work, it identified the classification that most closely addressed the scope, range of duties and skills that Appellant performs. Respondent argues that it correctly concluded that the Maintenance Mechanic I classification was the best fit for Appellant position and that Appellant failed to demonstrate that the designee's decision was substantially in error. Respondent could not confirm whether the Furniture Repair Worker classification specification was considered at either the local review or by the Department of Personnel's designee when reviewing Appellant's position.

Primary Issue. Whether the Director of the Department of Personnel correctly concluded that Appellant's position is properly allocated to the Maintenance Mechanic I classification or whether this matter should be remanded to the Director's designee for review of the Furniture Repair Worker classification.

Relevant Classifications. Maintenance Mechanic I (class code 5242); Carpenter (class code 5330); Drapery Fabricator (class code 4154); Utility Worker II (class code 5265) and Furniture Repair Worker (class code 5348).

Decision of the Board. The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a measurement of the volume of work performed nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular position to

1 the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the class which best
2 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v. Washington State
3 University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

4
5 To determine the class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position, it is
6 imperative that all relevant classifications be considered. The record before the Board shows that the
7 Director's designee failed to consider the Furniture Repair Worker classification when determining
8 whether Appellant was appropriately classified.

9
10 **Conclusion.** This matter should be remanded to the Director of the Department of Personnel for a
11 review of Appellant's duties and responsibilities and to determine whether Appellant's position is
12 properly allocated or whether it should be reallocated to the Furniture Repair Worker classification.

13
14 **ORDER**

15 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal of George Guadiz is remanded to the
16 Director of the Department of Personnel for a determination of whether his position is properly allocated
17 or whether it should be reallocated to the Furniture Repair Worker classification.

18 DATED this _____ day of _____, 2001.

19
20 WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

21 _____
22 Walter T. Hubbard, Chair

23 _____
24 Gerald L. Morgen, Vice Chair

25 _____
26 Leana D. Lamb, Member

Personnel Appeals Board
2828 Capitol Boulevard
Olympia, Washington 98504